

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119, and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for considering the references cited with the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 24, 2003.

**Objections to the Specification**

The Abstract has been objected to because of the phrase “figure 1” appearing at the end of the abstract. Applicants have provided a new abstract.

The Examiner has objected to the arrangement of the specification. In accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.125, a marked-up copy and a clean copy of a substitute specification is attached to correct the arrangement of the specification. Applicants submit that no new matter has been added to the substitute specification.

The Examiner has also objected to the use of claim numbers in the specification on pages 2-4. These claim number references have been deleted in the substitute specification.

**I. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication that claims 3-7 contain allowable subject matter and that these claims would be allowed if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of claims 1 and 2. Applicants submit that

rewritten independent claim 3 is patentable over the prior art. Further, since claims 4-7 depend from and incorporate all the limitations of claim 3 which has been rewritten in independent form, these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

## **II. Claim Objections**

Claim 5 has been objected to as containing an alternative phrase, “and/or.” Claim 5 has been amended to overcome this objection. Applicant submits that claim 5 is patentable at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 3.

## **III. Claim Rejections**

Claims 1-2 and 8-10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Bjork et al., U.S. 5,128,619 (“Bjork”). Applicants traverse this rejection because Bjork does not disclose at least a first module for making a first interpretation and a second module for making a second interpretation, as recited in the claims.

The Examiner alleges that Bjork discloses an interpretation system having a first module 16 for making a first interpretation 24 and a second module 14 for making a second interpretation (Fig. 1). Bjork, however, discloses a computer 14 that uses an application program to control the settings of a TDR 16 and read digital data from the TDR 16 that represents a waveform shown on the TDR display screen 24 (col. 3, ll. 15-18). The computer 14, using the digital data acquired from the TDR 16, interprets the data by calculating the length, attenuation, impedance and existence of any bridge taps or other discontinuities on a selected wire pair within

the cable being tested (col. 2, ll. 52-57). The display screen 24 merely displays the waveform associated with the collected data, but does not analyze or interpret the data (col. 3, ll. 15-18). In Bjork's invention, all data interpretation is performed by the computer 14, not by the TDR 16 or the display screen 24, therefore, only one module is involved.

Applicants submit that since Bjork does not disclose at least a first module for making a first interpretation and a second module for making a second interpretation, the reference does not disclose every element recited in the claims. Further, since Bjork does not disclose first and second interpretation modules, Applicants submit that it would not be obvious to modify Bjork with a third module as asserted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claims 1-2 and 8-10 are patentable over Bjork and respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

#### **IV. New Claims**

New claims 13-15, depending from claim 2, and new claims 16-20, depending from claim 8, have also been added to more completely claim Applicants' inventions. Applicants submit that these claims find support throughout the specification and are patentable over Bjork at least by virtue of their dependency. New claims 21-23 have also been added. Applicants submit that these claims find support in the specification at least on page 1, line 14-page 2, line 6, page 5, lines 18-24, page 6, line 15-page 7, line 16, and page 8, line 30-page 9, line 3, and are patentable over Bjork for at least the reasons set forth above.


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 Attorney Docket no. Q76451  
U.S. Application No. 10/625,629

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-23, which are all the claims pending in the application, are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of this application are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kelly G. Hyndman  
Registration No. 39,234

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 15, 2005